REMARKS

Claims 13-40, as amended, remain herein.

Minor, editorial changes have been made in claims 13, 22-25, 29-36 and 39.

Claims 13, 25, 30-36 and 39 have been amended to recite controlling a second appliance by linked operation controlling efficient operation in accordance with condition information first appliance. of the See applicants' specification at page 31, second full paragraph, -- page 32, last full paragraph, describing linked operations conducted by a controller, wherein a linked operation of a second appliance is executed in accordance with the condition information provided by a first appliance. An example is given wherein operation of an exhaust fan is automatically controlled in accordance with the settings of a cooking stove, as a result of a linked operation between fan and stove.

1. Claims 13, 14, 22, 23, 25-27 and 31-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Welmer U.S. Patent 5,499,018.

The presently claimed appliance in a home bus system for controlling a plurality of appliances and method for controlling such appliance comprises controlling a linked operation for controlling an efficient operation of one appliance in accordance with condition information of a first appliance. This arrangement and corresponding method are nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action alleges that Welmer '018, columns 6 and 7, describes maintaining condition and setting information and transmitting such information to a second appliance. Welmer '018 discloses a system in which information of a first apparatus is displayed to a user by another appliance that has an interconnection with the first appliance. However, Welmer '018 discloses only such display by one apparatus and transmission of that displayed information to the other apparatus, and does not disclose anything about the second appliance being operated or controlled using information of the first appliance, as recited in applicants' claims.

Moreover, in Welmer '018, the data displayed to the user is different from data for operating another appliance. though Accordingly, even data is received between apparatuses in Wilmer '018, such data is different from data transmitted and received in the presently claimed invention. Such data is not control data, for controlling operation of the second appliance.

For the foregoing reasons, Wilmer '018 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under \$102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Wilmer '018 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 14, 22 and 23 which depend from claim 13, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 13. Claims 26 27, which depend from claim 25, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 25. Claims 25, 31-36 and 39 are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 36, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 36.

Claim 40, which depends from claim 39, is allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 39. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 14-21, 24, 28, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Welmer '018 and Burgman et al. U.S. Patent 4,801,924.

The Office Action admits that Welmer '018 does <u>not</u> disclose periodic information and cites Burgman '924 as allegedly teaching same. However, Burgman '924 does <u>not</u> provide the deficiencies of Welmer '018 described herein.

Moreover, Burgman '924 discloses a programmable status transmitter with memory programmed to transmit status at change or at a programmed interval. Such security system only transmits information detected by the detectors, and does not operate another appliance based on that transmitted information. Burgman '924 does not disclose operation of a second appliance based on information of a first appliance, i.e., controlling a

linked operation of a second appliance in accordance with the condition information of a first appliance, as claimed.

For the foregoing reasons, neither Welmer '018 nor Burgman '924 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 15-21 and 24, which depend from claim 14, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 14. Claims 28 and 29, which depend from claim 25, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 25. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

All claims 13-40 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 13-40 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

March 8, 2004

Date

Roger W. Parkhurst

Registration No. 25,177

Robert N. Wieland

Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: OGOH:069

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P. 1421 Prince Street, Suite 210 Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805

Telephone: (703) 739-0220